out, there should be continuity of treatment between the community and prison.² There has been considerable pressure to ensure that the delivery of methadone detoxification to opiate users presenting to prison is adequate, and guidelines have been drawn up, with the cooperation of key people involved in drug treatment services, to promote this. Opiate users should be given sufficient methadone during drug withdrawal to reduce the likelihood of them injecting and using contaminated equipment.

Ross and colleagues insist that the existing seven day withdrawal regimen is unethical. Colleagues and I run an inpatient unit where we provide a 10 day withdrawal regimen for all our opiate dependent patients, and we can see no grounds for arguing that reducing this to seven days is unethical or fails to replicate the physiological rates of withdrawal.^{3,4} In my view such withdrawal regimens should be spread evenly throughout the prison system. According to the most recent report of the director of health care for prisoners, a survey of prison treatment establishments found that only a fifth of respondents were providing methadone detoxification for opiate withdrawal. All prison medical officers should provide approved treatments for drug withdrawal; more individualised treatment approaches can evolve in the wake of the widespread provision of a basic minimum of treatment.⁵

MICHAEL FARRELL
Consultant psychiatrist

JOHN STRANG
Deputy director

Addiction Research Unit,
National Addiction Centre,
Institute of Psychiatry,
London SE5 8AF

- Ross M, Grossman AB, Murdoch S, Bunday R, Golding J, Purchase S, *et al.* Prison: shield from threat, or threat to survival? *BMJ* 1994;308:1092-5. (23 April.)
- Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs. *AIDS and drug misuse update report*. London: HMSO, 1993.
- Gossop M, Griffiths P, Bradley B, Strang J. Opiate withdrawal symptoms in response to 10-day and 21-day methadone withdrawal programmes. *Br J Psychiatry* 1989;154:360-3.
- Jaffe J, Martin W. Opioid analgesics and antagonists. In: Goodman LS, Gilman A, eds. *Pharmacological basis of therapeutics*. New York: Macmillan, 1990:485-521.
- Director of Health Care for Prisoners. *Report*. London: HMSO, 1994.

Asthma and having siblings

EDITOR,—We recently completed a study examining risk factors for the development of asthma in 708 children aged 8-13 in New Zealand and found a similar effect for wheezing in the past year to that found by Erika von Mutius and colleagues,¹ with a declining frequency of wheezing with increasing numbers of older siblings.² From a questionnaire given to a parent or guardian we examined reported wheezing in the past year in relation to both older and younger children in the household.

The prevalence of symptoms declined with increasing numbers of old siblings and, to a less extent, with increasing numbers of young siblings (table). We observed a similar trend for symptoms

of hay fever and eczema in the past 12 months, although these trends were not significant.

The hypothesis that this trend might be due to the down regulation of IgE or an altered pattern of release of cytokines because of early exposure to bacterial or viral infections through having older siblings is intriguing, although other maternal and socioeconomic factors might explain the findings. Interestingly, in a study of infants Burr *et al* found the reverse of this trend, with increased reporting of wheeze, nasal discharge, and prolonged colds in the first year of life with increasing number of siblings³; this presumably confirms the increased risk of exposure to viral and bacterial infections in early infancy with increasing numbers of siblings.

JULIAN CRANE

Senior research fellow

NEIL PEARCE

Senior research fellow

ROBYN SHAW

Senior research fellow

PENNY FITZHARRIS

Senior lecturer in medicine

Wellington Asthma Research Group,
Department of Medicine,
Wellington School of Medicine,
Wellington Hospital,
Wellington,
New Zealand

Whakatane Hospital,
Whakatane,
New Zealand

CHRIS MAYES

Paediatrician

- Von Mutius E, Martinez F, Fritsch C, Nicolai T, Reitmeir P, Thierman H-H. Skin test reactivity and number of siblings. *BMJ* 1994;308:692-5. (12 March.)
- Shaw R, Woodman K, Crane J, Moyes C, Kennedy J, Pearce N. Risk factors for asthma symptoms in Kawerau children. *NZ Med J* (in press).
- Burr M, Miskelly F, Butland B, Merrett G, Vaughan-Williams E. Environmental factors and symptoms in infants at high risk of allergy. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 1989;43:125-32.

Pneumocystis pneumonia

EDITOR,—Simon P Matusiewicz and colleagues questioned whether reactivation or reinfection was responsible for pneumocystis pneumonia.¹ They used an immunofluorescence assay to examine 220 samples of bronchoalveolar lavage fluid and bronchial washings, but only five samples were found to be positive for *Pneumocystis carinii*. Although the authors quoted work suggesting that immunofluorescence assay was as sensitive as techniques that use the polymerase chain reaction, this is contrary to our experience.

The last 18 samples of bronchoalveolar lavage fluid from 11 patients were examined by a nested polymerase chain reaction and immunofluorescence assay. The results were instructive: the polymerase chain reaction confirmed the results of the immunofluorescence assay in 13; three equivocal results of the immunofluorescence assay were confirmed as positive by the polymerase chain reaction, and the patients responded to treatment; and two samples that yielded negative results in the immunofluorescence assay were positive with the polymerase chain reaction, and again the patients responded to treatment. In patients without pneumocystis pneumonia the concentration of *P carinii* would be low, so it is critical that a sensitive method is used. We believe that it would be informative for the authors to test with the polymerase chain reaction the 215 samples that yielded negative results in the immunofluorescence assay.

All five positive results in the authors' study occurred in patients with small cell lung cancer, and the authors thought that the infection was subclinical. Another fundamental question is how laboratory tests can help clinicians decide on the importance of a positive result. This can be confusing as *P carinii* may be detected when the pneumonia is due to another cause.² We believe

that in these cases serological testing for *P carinii* may be of benefit.^{3,4} We have found that serological testing is particularly useful in patients who do not have AIDS⁵; as these patients have fewer cysts and trophozoites the result is more helpful.

We agree that immunocompromised patients should be monitored prospectively, but we would also perform serological tests. For doctors to deal adequately with pneumocystis pneumonia in immunocompromised patients further studies are required to address fundamental questions on the importance of this infection.

REVANS

Grade B scientist

K F WHYTE

Consultant physician

J M W CHATTERTON

Grade B scientist

D O HO-YEN

Consultant microbiologist

Raigmore NHS Trust Hospital,
Inverness IV2 3UJ

- Matusiewicz SP, Fergusson RJ, Greening AP, Crompton GK, Burns SM. Pneumocystis carinii in bronchoalveolar lavage fluid and bronchial washings. *BMJ* 1994;308:1206-7. (7 May.)
- Allegra CJ, Chabner BA, Tuazon CU, Ogata-Arakaki D, Baird B, Drake JC, *et al.* Trimetrexate for the treatment of Pneumocystis carinii pneumonia in patients with the acquired immunodeficiency syndrome. *N Engl J Med* 1987;317:978-85.
- Ho-Yen DO, Chatterton JMW, Joss AWL. Pneumocystis carinii pneumonia. *BMJ* 1988;297:855.
- Evans R, Dargie L, Chatterton JMW, Ho-Yen DO. Serological diagnosis of P carinii infection. *Communicable Diseases and Environmental Health Scotland Weekly Report* 1993;27:5-8.

Discrimination against people with HIV infection and AIDS

EDITOR,—Renée Danziger's paper on discrimination against people with HIV infection and AIDS in Poland, in particular by health staff,¹ stimulated us to update our study on this in Italy. Between May 1991 and May this year, by means of a coded questionnaire distributed to all consenting patients attending the division of medical oncology and AIDS of the Centro di Riferimento Oncologico, Aviano, Italy, we interviewed 212 patients about whether they had been discriminated against by health care workers. One hundred and sixty two patients were men (the median age 30 (range 20-65)).

Two hundred and nine of those interviewed were HIV positive; 140 were injecting drug users, which accords with Italian epidemiological findings with regard to HIV infection. Seventy six reported 88 episodes of discrimination by health care workers (dentists and doctors in almost all cases) in public and private Italian institutions. In three cases nurses were involved. Thirteen patients reported more than one episode of discrimination. Dentists were the category of health care workers most commonly mentioned, with 44 episodes of discrimination, while no infectious disease specialist was mentioned. The nature of the reported episodes differed, but in 60 cases the patients had been denied the health care service requested.

One hundred and seventy six patients spontaneously reported to health care workers that they were HIV positive while 36 did not; 14 did not do so because they had previously suffered discrimination while 10 had never reported their seropositive status and had never suffered discrimination, and 12 patients did not give a reason for not reporting their status. Twenty two continued to report their status despite having been discriminated against previously. Sometimes those who did not report their HIV status reported instead that they were suffering from hepatitis, to allow health care workers to take more precautions.

This study shows that there is a high rate of discrimination by Italian health staff against

Prevalence of reported wheezing in past year among 708 children aged 8-13 related to number of older and younger children in household

No of siblings	% (No) with wheeze		Odds ratio (95% confidence interval)*	
	With older siblings	With younger siblings	With older siblings	With younger siblings
0	24.8 (96)	25.9 (67)	1	1
1	18.8 (45)	19.7 (46)	0.7 (0.5 to 1.1)	0.7 (0.5 to 1.1)
2	13.6 (9)	14.4 (20)	0.5 (0.2 to 1.0)	0.5 (0.3 to 0.9)
≥3	6.7 (1)	24.6 (15)	0.2 (0 to 1.6)	0.9 (0.5 to 1.9)

*Unadjusted odds ratios.

P value for trend: older siblings, $P < 0.01$; younger siblings, $P = 0.09$.